D/REO TALKING POINTS FOR DDR&E STEERING GROUP MEETING
ON PROPOSED ONE PERCENT PACKAGE
18 October 1988

Introduction

o   Thanks, Doug.

o   As you know, the general process and criteria for putting together the proposed package that we distributed last Friday is described therein as Attachment 3.

o   Let me just hit the high points from that attachment, and be a little more specific today on how the criteria were applied in the final stages of creating the proposed package.

Identification of Candidate Initiatives

25X1

o   In total, about [   ] initiatives were considered in the process, whose total cost in FY 1990 amounted to [   ]   25X1

o   They came primarily from the Program Offices directly. In addition, we tolerated some initiatives sponsored by DCI Committee Chairmen and NIOs.

  --   Regardless of the source, all initiatives were sent back through the Program and Budget Office to the cognizant Program Office for their judgement on the validity of the numbers and endorsement.

  -   Program Office judgements were indicated on each initiative's writeup.

Creation of Bundles

o   Initiatives were grouped into bundles. There are five "substantive" bundles keyed to areas of particular emphasis highlighted in the DCI program guidance.

25X1

[   ]

  Plus three bundles for initiatives not directly related to the substantive areas of interest:

25X1

[   ]

  Plus:

25X1

[   ]

Creation of Gaps

o   Gaps were identified by the IPC Staff for the five substantive bundles to guide the evaluation.

SECRET

Work of Evaluation Teams

Initial evaluation was done by

o   Evaluation teams, whose ~~participants primarily were drawn from Community~~ ~~entities that support the DCI (i.e. NIOs, DCI Committee Chairmen, etc.)~~, were assigned to ~~rank initiatives~~ withing each bundle ~~and assign them to~~ High, Medium, and Low ~~priority bands.~~

--   This was done through a ~~series of meetings~~ held the week of 4-11 October.

--   ~~General criteria~~ recommended to the groups was to give ~~highest priority~~ ~~to those initiatives that were cheapest, available soonest, and most~~ ~~effective in reducing gaps~~--criteria similar to those used in the SSCI study.

--   Also, in the course of their deliberations, the evaluation teams prompted ~~rescoping of~~ some initiatives to make them more competitive.

o   The summary results of the evaluation teams' efforts are included in the ~~Annex~~ to Attachment 3.

o   These team judgements were the ~~basis for our first-cut identification~~ of the ~~70-or-so highest-priority initiatives~~, whose descriptions we ~~distributed last~~ ~~Tuesday.~~

Creation of Proposed Package

o   The ~~final step was to interleave~~ the initiatives from the bundles ~~into a~~ ~~proposed package.~~

o   ~~I did that~~, with guidance and review from [   ] and General Heinz.

o   In doing so, we used some basic criteria to guide our work:

--   In ~~picking from within a bundle~~, I tried to select initiatives in the same order as recommended by the evaluation teams.

-   We ~~asked for their advice~~, they did a generally ~~conscientious job~~ ~~of working the problem~~, and therefore, in my view, ~~their opinions~~ ~~should carry significant weight~~.

--   In picking initiatives ~~across bundles~~, ~~highest priority was given to the~~ ~~five substantive bundles that focused on areas of particular emphasis~~, ~~next highest to PEA/Infrastructure, and lowest priority to Collection.~~

-   This is ~~consistent with the concerns and areas of emphasis~~ ~~expressed by the DCI in his program guidance last spring~~. ~~It also~~ ~~conforms to the DCI view expounded in the SSCI study and follow-on~~ ~~work that highest leverage can be achieved by those activities that~~ ~~make better use of data being collected or programmed to be~~ ~~collected.~~

o   Operationally, we used these criteria as follows:

   --   First, we explored a number of trial runs to get a feel for the five
        year funding associated with various trial packages--i.e. include all
        high band initiatives, include all high plus medium band initiatives,
        etc.

   --   Once the possibilities became more clear, we focused more seriously
        on a "strawman" package which included all initiatives from:

        -   The high and medium bands for the five substantive bundles.

        -   The high band for the PEA/Infrastructure bundles.

        -   The top part of the high band for the Collection bundle.

   --   Then we tweaked this strawman:

        -   To reflect special concerns that either I or the Evaluation Team
            leaders had about specific initiatives.

        -   And, to put us in the funding ballpark, given the amount of
            money that [   ] were concurrently earmarking
            for ESCI.

   --   The number of changes made during this tweaking process were few.
        Examples include:

25X1

o   The package that resulted from all of this--as Doug pointed out in his
    memo--was somewhat in excess of the five-year profile. But rather than
    further fine tune it ourselves, we thought it would be a useful starting
    point for today's discussion.